UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,058	04/06/2007	Lucile Gambut-Garel	1022702-000136	4269

21839 7590 10/12/2011

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
SCULLY, STEVEN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1727	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/12/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,058	GAMBUT-GAREL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEVEN SCULLY	1727	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 7-24* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 7-24* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

CROSSLINKABLE COMPOSITION FOR A BATTERY ELECTROLYTE

Examiner: Scully S.N.: 10/553,058

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 20, 2011 has been entered. Claims 4-6 have been canceled and claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 16-20 and 24 have been amended, where claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of previous claim 6. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 7-24 are pending in the application.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-3 and 7-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (US2002/0051911).

With respect to claim 1, Okada discloses a curable composition for a polymer electrolyte which comprises constituents (A) to (D) as an essential constituent, wherein

(A) is a polysiloxane having a polyethylene oxide (polyoxyalkylene ether) structure-containing group on a silicon atom and having two or more SiH groups, (B) is a compound having at least one structure selected from a siloxy linkage and having two or more alkenyl groups, (C) is a hydrosilylation catalyst, and (D) is an electrolyte salt compound. See abstract. A specific example of the constituent (B) is 1,3-divinyl-1,1,3,3-tetramethyldisiloxane, which is considered a polyorganosiloxane. See [0054].

Okada does not expressly disclose the SiH groups on the **(B)** compound or the alkenyl groups on the **(A)** compound as claimed (instead disclosing the opposite). However, the purpose of the SiH and alkenyl groups is to cross-link the polymers. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that the SiH groups of constituent (A) and the alkenyl groups of constituent (B) are substitutable for each other and would yield the predictable results of cross-linkable polymers that would, upon cross-linking, yield the same polymer. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR),* 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). Okada discloses the polyorganosiloxane as shown in the structural formula of paragraph [0026]. The R group comprises at least 2 hydrogens bonded to the silicon (i.e., at least 2 “o” integers as claimed). See [0027]. This is considered to be substitutable with at least 2 alkenyl groups. Further, "m" is an integer of not less than 1, allowing at least 1 polyoxyalkylene ether (applicant's Y functional group).

With respect to claim 2, Okada molar ratio of constituent (A) to (B) of 0.05 to 3.0. See [0068]. Thus, the ratio of hydrogen atoms bonded to silicon to the number of alkenyl radicals would fall within the claimed range. In the case where the claimed

ranges “overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art” a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).

With respect to claim 3, the polyoxyalkylene ether of the constituent (A) is, for example, a polyoxypropylene ether. See [0026-0027].

With respect to claim 7, Okada discloses the polyorganosiloxane as shown in the structural formula of paragraph [0026]. The R group comprises at least 2 hydrogens bonded to the silicon (i.e., at least 2 “o” integers as claimed). See [0027]. This, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, is considered to be substitutable with at least 2 alkenyl groups. Further, "m" is an integer of not less than 1, allowing at least 1 polyoxyalkylene ether (applicant's Y functional group).

With respect to claim 8, Okada specifically discloses vinyl, which the examiner believes would represent the claimed percentage under certain polymer conditions provided by Okada, while meeting the requirements of claim 6.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, Okada discloses 1,3-divinyl-1,1,3,3-tetramethyldisiloxane. See [0054]. As discussed above, the divinyl would be substitutable for hydrogen groups. This would represent the formula of claim 10 wherein p and q are 0 and the two end groups carry a hydrogen directly bonded to the silicon atom.

With respect to claims 11-14 and 16, Okada discloses the electrolyte to be $LiClO_4$, $LiPF_6$, $LiBF_4$, and so on. Se [0066].

With respect to claim 15, Okada discloses a 3.0-g portion of the polysiloxane obtained having a polyethylene oxide structure and a cyclic carbonate structure to be

admixed with 3.4mmol of $LiCF_3SO_3$. Okada further discloses a wide range of possible structural formulas for the polyorganosiloxane. See [0026-0027]. It is the position of the Examiner that the O/Li ratio would fall within the claimed range. In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).

With respect to claims 17 and 18, Okada discloses the metal cation may be manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, zinc and silver. See [0065].

With respect to claims 19 and 20, Okada discloses the electrolyte may be an organic electrolyte such as propylene carbonate, and so forth. See [0070].

With respect to claim 21, Okada discloses the hydrosilylation catalyst (C) is based on platinum-vinylsiloxane, chloroplatinic acid, $Pt(COD)_2$ and the like. See [0059].

With respect to claims 22-24, Okada discloses a curable composition for a polymer electrolyte which comprises constituents (A) to (D) as an essential constituent, wherein (A) is a polysiloxane having a polyethylene oxide (polyoxyalkylene) structure-containing group on a silicon atom and having two or more SiH groups, (B) is a compound having at least one structure selected from a siloxy linkage and having two or more alkenyl groups, (C) is a hydrosilylation catalyst, and (D) is an electrolyte salt compound. See abstract. A specific example of the constituent (B) is 1,3-divinyl-1,1,3,3-tetramethyldisiloxane, which is considered a polyorganosiloxane. See [0054].

Okada does not expressly disclose the SiH groups on the **(B)** compound or the alkenyl groups on the **(A)** compound as claimed (instead disclosing the opposite). However, the purpose of the SiH and alkenyl groups is to cross-link the polymers.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that the SiH groups of constituent (A) and the alkenyl groups of constituent (B) are substitutable for each other and would yield the predictable results of cross-linkable polymers that would, upon cross-linking, yield the same polymer. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR),* 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). Okada discloses the polyorganosiloxane as shown in the structural formula of paragraph [0026]. The R group comprises at least 2 hydrogens bonded to the silicon (i.e., at least 2 “o” integers as claimed). See [0027]. This is considered to be substitutable with at least 2 alkenyl groups. Further, "m" is an integer of not less than 1, allowing at least 1 polyoxyalkylene ether (applicant's Y functional group).

This polymer electrolyte is then positioned between an anode and a cathode in a battery wherein the cathode consists of lithium metal, lithium alloys, inorganic materials with lithium therein, and so forth. See [0081-0084].

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed August 24, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues:

a) There is nothing in Okada that teaches or suggests that constituent B is a polyorganosiloxane.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Particularly, the compound B is 1,3-divinyl-1,1,3,3-tetramethyldisiloxane. See [0054]. Referring to claim 10, this compound as discussed in the claim rejection where the divinyl groups are substitutable for hydrogen

groups matches the general formula (IV) as required for the polyorganosiloxane (B) of claim 1, wherein p and q are 0 and the two end groups carry a hydrogen directly bonded to the silicon atom. Thus, it is the position of the Examiner that the compound meets the claimed limitations. Further arguments with respect to compound B being a polyorganosiloxane are similarly considered herein.

b) Okada further teaches that constituent (B) should not have any polyethylene oxide structure, In particular any polyalkyleneoxide.

The claim limitation requires that constituent (A) have the polyalkyleneoxide, of which Okada discloses. See [0040]. Regarding substitution, the polyalkyleneoxide is unrelated and would be maintained on the polyorganosiloxane A of Okada. Crosslinking occurs between the Si-divinyl groups and the Si-H groups, where the substitution is deemed obvious, as discussed above.

Stated differently, Okada discloses to constituent (B) should not have any polyethylene oxide structure, in particular any polyalkyleneoxide. Constituent (A) of Okada comprises the polyalkyleneoxide. Substitution between constituent (A) and constituent (B) are deemed obvious for the crosslinking groups Si-divinyl and Si-H where the crosslinking would occur because the crosslinked polymer would yield the same structure of constituent (A) and constituent (B) crosslinked by the dinvinyl groups. Thus, Okada does not teach away from the claimed invention because the polyalkyleneoxide is not on constituent (B) but is on constituent (A). Okada makes no teaching that constituent (A) not have a polyalkyleneoxide, nor that the resulting

crosslinked polymer be detrimentally effected by the presence of a polyalkyleneoxide on constituent (A), but instead only on constituent (B). See [0051].

Contact/Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Scully whose telephone number is (571)270-5267. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Barbara Gilliam can be reached on (571)272-1330. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 1727

/Barbara L. Gilliam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1727